Asymptotic Optimality of Massive MIMO Systems Using Densely Spaced Transmit Antennas

Keigo Takeuchi
Dept. Commun. Eng. & Informatics, University of Electro-Communications, Tokyo 182-8585, Japan
Email: ktakeuchi@uec.ac.jp

arXiv:1601.05873v1 [cs.IT] 22 Jan 2016

***Abstract*—This paper investigates the performance of a massive multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) system that uses a large transmit antenna array with antenna elements spaced densely. Under the assumption of idealized uniform linear antenna arrays without mutual coupling, precoded quadrature phase-shift keying (QPSK) transmission is proved to achieve the channel capacity of the massive MIMO system when the transmit antenna separation tends to zero. This asymptotic optimality is analogous to that of QPSK faster-than-Nyquist signaling.**

I. Introduction

Half wavelength was proved to be the critical antenna separation to attain the maximum spatial degrees of freedom in multiple-input multiple-output (MIMO) systems [1]. Thus, there are no points in considering more densely spaced antennas when optimal Gaussian signaling is used. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the impact of transmit antenna separation on achievable rate when suboptimal quadrature phase-shift keying (QPSK) is used.

We exploit an analogy between a transmit antenna array and a band-limited system, pointed out in [1]. Let $L_{\rm t}$ denote the array length normalized by the carrier wavelength. The spatial domain $[-L_{\rm t}/2, L_{\rm t}/2]$ in the array corresponds to the time domain in the band-limited system with bandwidth $W = 2$, while the angular domain $[-1, 1]$ does to the frequency domain $[-W/2, W/2]$. The critical normalized antenna separation $\Delta_{\rm t} = 1/2$ is due to Nyquist's sampling theorem, claiming that sampling at the Nyquist period $1/W$ reconstructs any band-limited signal, when the array length $L_{\rm t}$ tends to infinity.

Faster-than-Nyquist (FTN) signaling [2], [3] increases the transmission rate of band-limited systems by sending pulses at a symbol period shorter than the Nyquist period. Yoo and Cho [4] proved that QPSK FTN signaling achieves the channel capacity of the additive white Gaussian noise (AWGN) channel when the symbol period tends to zero. The main contribution of this paper is to prove an analogous result: Precoded QPSK transmission can achieve the channel capacity of massive MIMO systems when the transmit antenna separation tends to zero.

II. System Model

A. MIMO Channel

Consider a MIMO channel with M transmit antennas and N receive antennas. The received vector $\boldsymbol{y} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ is given by

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \sqrt{\gamma}\boldsymbol{H}\boldsymbol{x} + \boldsymbol{w}, \tag{1}$$

with $\boldsymbol{w} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{I}_N)$. In (1), $\boldsymbol{H} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times M}$ denotes the channel matrix between the transmitter and the receiver. The vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{C}^M$ is the transmitted vector with power constraint $\mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2] \le 1$, so that the parameter $\gamma > 0$ corresponds to the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR).

B. Uniform Linear Antenna Array

In order to introduce a deterministic physical model of the channel matrix, we consider idealized uniform linear antenna arrays without mutual coupling. In realistic antenna arrays, coupling between adjacent antenna elements occurs when the antenna elements are spaced closely [5]. However, the influence of mutual coupling may be mitigated by constructing a matching network at each antenna array [6]. For simplicity, the influence of mutual coupling is ignored in this paper.

Let $\Delta_{\rm t} \in (0, 1/2]$ and $\Delta_{\rm r} \in (0, 1/2]$ denote the transmit and receive antenna separations normalized by the carrier wavelength, respectively, while the normalized lengths of the transmit and receive antenna arrays are written as $L_{\rm t}$ and $L_{\rm r}$. We assume that each array length is a multiple of the corresponding antenna separation, so that $N = L_{\rm r}/\Delta_{\rm r}$ and $M = L_{\rm t}/\Delta_{\rm t}$ hold. Then, we follow [7, Eq. (7.56)] to model the channel matrix $\boldsymbol{H}$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{H} = \sqrt{NM}\int a(p)\boldsymbol{s}_{L_{\rm r},\Delta_{\rm r}}(\Omega_{\rm r}(p))\boldsymbol{s}^{\rm H}_{L_{\rm t},\Delta_{\rm t}}(\Omega_{\rm t}(p))dp. \tag{2}$$

In (2), $a(p)$ denotes the complex attenuation of path p. The directional cosines $\Omega_{\rm t}(p) = \cos\phi_{\rm t}(p)$ and $\Omega_{\rm r}(p) = \cos\phi_{\rm r}(p)$ for path p are defined via the departure angle $\phi_{\rm t}(p)$ from the transmit antenna array and via the incidence angle $\phi_{\rm r}(p)$ to the receive antenna array, respectively. For a uniform linear antenna array with normalized array length L and antenna separation Δ, the normalized spatial signature vector $\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega) \in \mathbb{C}^{L/\Delta}$ with respect to directional cosine Ω is given by

$$\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L/\Delta}}\left(1, e^{-2\pi j\Delta\Omega}, \ldots, e^{-2\pi j(L/\Delta-1)\Delta\Omega}\right)^{\rm T}, \tag{3}$$

where j denotes the imaginary unit.

C. Angular Domain Representation

We next introduce the angular domain representation of the channel matrix (2). Since $\{\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(k/L)|k \in [0 : L/\Delta)\}$[1]

[1] For integers a and b, $[a : b)$ represents the set $\{a, a+1, \ldots, b-1\}$.

form an orthonormal basis of $\mathbb{C}^{L/\Delta}$ [7], we can represent any signature vector $\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega)$ as

$$\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega) = \sum_{k=0}^{L/\Delta-1} f_{L,\Delta}\left(\frac{k}{L} - \Omega\right) \boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}\left(\frac{k}{L}\right), \quad (4)$$

with

$$f_{L,\Delta}(\Omega) = \boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}^{\mathrm{H}}(0)\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega). \quad (5)$$

In the derivation of (4), we have used the fact that the inner product $\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}^{\mathrm{H}}(\Omega')\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(\Omega)$ depends only on the difference $\Omega - \Omega'$. Applying (4) to the channel matrix (2) yields

$$\sqrt{\gamma}\boldsymbol{H} = \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{r}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}}, \quad (6)$$

where we have defined the normalized SNR $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma/(4\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}\Delta_{\mathrm{r}})$.

In (6), the kth column of the $L/\Delta \times L/\Delta$ unitary matrix $\boldsymbol{U}_{L,\Delta}$ is given by $\boldsymbol{s}_{L,\Delta}(k/L)$ for all $k \in [0 : L/\Delta)$, so that $\boldsymbol{U}_{L,\Delta}$ is the L/Δ-point discrete Fourier transform (DFT) matrix. Furthermore, the (n,m) entry $g_{n,m}$ of the channel matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}} \in \mathbb{C}^{N\times M}$ in the angular domain is given by

$$g_{n,m} = \sqrt{4L_{\mathrm{t}}L_{\mathrm{r}}} \int a(p) f_{L_{\mathrm{r}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}\left(\frac{n}{L_{\mathrm{r}}} - \Omega_{\mathrm{r}}(p)\right) \cdot f_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{*}\left(\frac{m}{L_{\mathrm{t}}} - \Omega_{\mathrm{t}}(p)\right) dp. \quad (7)$$

Remark 1: The normalized SNR $\tilde{\gamma}$ in (6) increases as the antenna separation Δ_{t} decreases. This improvement in SNR results from the power gain obtained by using multiple antennas [7]. However, we have ignored an effective power loss due to mutual coupling, so that it may be fair to compare different systems with identical normalized SNR $\tilde{\gamma}$.

D. Constrained Capacity

Let $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$ denote an $M \times M$ input covariance matrix with power constraint $\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M) \le 1$. It is well known that the constrained capacity $C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})$ of the MIMO channel (1) with the channel matrix (6) is given by

$$C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) = \log\det\left(\boldsymbol{I} + \tilde{\gamma}\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}}\boldsymbol{Q}_M\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}^{\mathrm{H}}\right), \quad (8)$$

which is achieved by Gaussian signaling $\boldsymbol{x} \sim \mathcal{CN}(\boldsymbol{0}, \boldsymbol{Q}_M)$.

The channel capacity is the maximum of the constrained capacity (8) over all possible input covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$. Poon *et al.* [1], [8] proved that the maximum spatial degrees of freedom in the MIMO channel are equal to $2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}$: The capacity is proportional to $2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}\log\tilde{\gamma}$ in the high SNR regime under richly scattering environments.

III. Main Results

A. Large-System Analysis

Large-system analysis has been considered to evaluate the performance of massive MIMO systems, on the basis of random matrix theory [9]–[11] or of the replica method [12]–[18]. Since statistical channel models were used in previous works, the system parameters were the numbers of transmit and receive antennas. In our deterministic model, however, the array length and the antenna separation are the fundamental parameters to describe the channel model [1]. Thus, we consider the large-system limit in which M, N, L_{t}, and L_{r} tend to infinity while the ratios $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} = L_{\mathrm{t}}/M$, $\Delta_{\mathrm{r}} = L_{\mathrm{r}}/N$, and $\alpha = L_{\mathrm{t}}/L_{\mathrm{r}}$ are kept constant. This is the precise meaning of massive MIMO in this paper.



Fig. 1. Beamforming patterns $(\phi, |f_{L,\Delta}(k/L - \cos\phi)|)$ for the critically spaced case $\Delta = 1/2$, and $(\phi, |f_{L,\Delta}(k'/L - \cos\phi)|)$ for the densely spaced case $\Delta = 1/4$. The normalized array length is set to $L = 4$.

In this paper, we discuss uniform convergence over a class $\mathfrak{C}$ of channel instances $\mathcal{C} = \{a(\cdot), \Omega_{\mathrm{t}}(\cdot), \Omega_{\mathrm{r}}(\cdot)\}$.

Assumption 1: Let $\{s_l \in \mathbb{N}\}_{l=1}^{\infty}$ denote a slowly diverging sequence of natural numbers, which means the limits $s_l \to \infty$ and $s_l/l \to 0$ as $l \to \infty$. For $\mathcal{D}_l = [-(1 - s_l/l), 1 - s_l/l]$, postulate a class $\mathfrak{C}$ of channel instances (a set of $\mathcal{C}$) such that i) $\Omega_{\mathrm{t}}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{D}_{L_{\mathrm{t}}}$ and $\Omega_{\mathrm{r}}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{D}_{L_{\mathrm{r}}}$ hold, and that ii) the total power $\int |a(p)|^2 dp$ of attenuation and the maximum singular value of $\min\{2L_{\mathrm{t}}, 2L_{\mathrm{r}}\}^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}$ are uniformly bounded in the large-system limit for all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$.

The latter assumption forbids one to enjoy noise-less eigen channels in the large-system limit. The former assumption is a sufficient condition for proving the main theorems with respect to Gaussian signaling. Note that this assumption should almost surely hold in the large-system limit, if channel instances are sampled from proper statistical models.

B. Gaussian Signaling

For any input covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$, we define the covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M = \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}}\boldsymbol{Q}_M\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}$ to specify the structure of the optimal covariance matrix in the large-system limit.

When the densely spaced case $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}, \Delta_{\mathrm{r}} < 1/2$ is considered, as indicated from Fig. 1, most of the power of the channel gains $g_{n,m}$ is concentrated on indices $n \in \mathcal{N} = [0 : L_{\mathrm{r}}] \cup [N - L_{\mathrm{r}} : N)$ and $m \in \mathcal{M} = [0 : L_{\mathrm{t}}] \cup [M - L_{\mathrm{t}} : M)$ in the large-system limit. In order to present a precise statement on this observation, we shall define the effective channel matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}$ as

$$(\tilde{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})_{n,m} = \begin{cases} g_{n,m} & \text{for } (n,m) \in \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{M}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

Assumption 2: Postulate the set $\mathfrak{S}_M$ of $M \times M$ covariance matrices such that, for all $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M \in \mathfrak{S}_M$, the power constraint $\mathrm{Tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M) \leq 1$ is satisfied, and that the maximum eigenvalue of $2L_{\mathrm{t}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M$ is uniformly bounded in the large-system limit.

Theorem 1: Let $\boldsymbol{Q}_M = \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}}$, and fix SNR $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$, receive antenna separation $\Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \in (0, 1/2]$, and load $\alpha = L_{\mathrm{t}}/L_{\mathrm{r}} > 0$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2,

$$\frac{|C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) - C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})|}{2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}} \to 0 \quad (10)$$

holds uniformly for all transmit antenna separations $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \in (0, 1/2]$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M \in \mathfrak{S}_M$, and all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ in the large-system limit.

Proof: See a long version of this paper [19]. ∎

Theorem 1 implies that, as long as the large-system limit is taken, it is sufficient to consider covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M$ with all-zero vectors in columns $(L_{\mathrm{t}} : M - L_{\mathrm{t}})$ and in rows $(L_{\mathrm{t}} : M - L_{\mathrm{t}})$. Under this restriction, we next make a comparison between the critically spaced case and the densely spaced case. For notational convenience, we define $\boldsymbol{E}_{n,k}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ as the extended matrix obtained by inserting k all-zero columns and k all-zero rows after the first n columns and rows of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, respectively.

Theorem 2: Let $\boldsymbol{Q}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}} = \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}} \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},1/2}^{\mathrm{H}}$ and

$$\boldsymbol{Q}_M = \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}} \boldsymbol{E}_{L_{\mathrm{t}}+1, M-(2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1)}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}) \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}}. \quad (11)$$

Assume that

$$\mathrm{Tr}\left\{ \left(\boldsymbol{E}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},1}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}}) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \right)^2 \right\} \to 0 \quad (12)$$

holds as $L_{\mathrm{t}} \to \infty$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for fixed SNR $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ and load $\alpha > 0$

$$\frac{|C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}}; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{1/2,1/2}) - C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{G}}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})|}{2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}} \to 0 \quad (13)$$

holds uniformly for all antenna separations $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}, \Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \leq 1/2$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$, and all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ in the large-system limit.

Proof: See a long version of this paper [19]. ∎

Combining Theorems 1 and 2 implies that the normalized capacity for the critically spaced case coincides with that for the densely spaced case in the large-system limit. Thus, there are no points in considering the densely spaced case, as long as Gaussian signaling is used. To the best of author's knowledge, the two theorems are the first results for finite SNRs, while the optimality of the critically spaced case was proved in the high SNR regime [8].

C. Non-Gaussian Signaling

For a square root $\boldsymbol{Q}_M^{1/2}$ of the input covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$, we next investigate the precoded QPSK scheme $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{Q}_M^{1/2}\boldsymbol{b}$, in which $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_0, \ldots, b_{M-1})^{\mathrm{T}}$ has independent QPSK elements with unit power. The achievable rate $C(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})$ of the precoded QPSK scheme is defined as

$$C(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) = I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}), \quad (14)$$

where the effective MIMO channel is given by

$$\boldsymbol{y} = \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}}\boldsymbol{A}\boldsymbol{b} + \boldsymbol{w}, \quad (15)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{A} = \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{r}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}} \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}} \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{Q}_M^{1/2}. \quad (16)$$

Theorem 3: Consider the input covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$ given by (11). Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for fixed SNR $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ and load $\alpha > 0$

$$\frac{|C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) - C(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})|}{2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}} \to 0 \quad (17)$$

holds uniformly for all receive antenna separations $\Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \in (0, 1/2]$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$, and all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ in the dense limit $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \to 0$ after taking the large-system limit.

Proof: See Section IV. ∎

Theorem 3 implies that the precoded QPSK scheme can achieve the normalized capacity of the massive MIMO channel as the transmit antenna separation Δ_{t} tends to zero. The result is analogous to the optimality of QPSK FTN signaling over the AWGN channel as the symbol period tends to zero [4].

IV. Proof of Theorem 3

A. Outline

The proof strategy in [4] is re-organized to prove Theorem 3. The proof consists of three steps. In a first step, a lower bound on the achievable rate (14) is derived on the basis of the linear minimum mean-square error (LMMSE) receiver with successive interference cancellation (SIC).

In a second step, we prove that the signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR) in each stage of SIC tends to zero in the dense limit after taking the large-system limit. Then, the interference-plus-noise is replaced with a circularly symmetric complex Gaussian (CSCG) random variable by using the fact that, when QPSK is used, the worst-case additive noise in the low SINR regime is Gaussian [20].

In the last step, we utilize the second-order optimality [21] of QPSK for the AWGN channel in the low SINR regime to replace the data symbols by optimal Gaussian data symbols. Theorem 3 follows from the optimality of the LMMSE-SIC for Gaussian signaling.

B. LMMSE-SIC

Using the chain rule for the mutual information (14) yields

$$I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} I(b_m; \boldsymbol{y} | b_0, \ldots, b_{m-1}). \quad (18)$$

We consider the LMMSE estimator $\hat{b}_m$ of b_m based on the known information $\boldsymbol{y}$ and $\{b_{m'} | m' \in [0 : m)\}$ to obtain the lower bound

$$I(b_m; \boldsymbol{y} | b_0, \ldots, b_{m-1}) \geq I(b_m; \hat{b}_m | b_0, \ldots, b_{m-1}). \quad (19)$$

In (19), the LMMSE estimator $\hat{b}_m$ [7, Eq. (8.66)] is given by

$$\hat{b}_m = \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{a}_m^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_m \left(\boldsymbol{y} - \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}} \sum_{m'=0}^{m-1} \boldsymbol{a}_{m'} b_{m'} \right), \quad (20)$$

with

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}_m = \left(\boldsymbol{I} + \tilde{\gamma} \sum_{m'=m+1}^{M-1} \boldsymbol{a}_{m'} \boldsymbol{a}_{m'}^{\mathrm{H}} \right)^{-1}, \tag{21}$$

where $\boldsymbol{a}_m \in \mathbb{C}^N$ denotes the mth column vector of the effective channel matrix (16).

Let us derive an explicit expression of the lower bound (19). Substituting (15) into the LMMSE estimator (20) yields

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho_m}} \hat{b}_m = \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m, \tag{22}$$

with

$$\rho_m = \tilde{\gamma} \boldsymbol{a}_m^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_m \boldsymbol{a}_m. \tag{23}$$

In (22), the interference-plus-noise $v_m \in \mathbb{C}$ is given by

$$\sqrt{\rho_m} v_m = \tilde{\gamma} \sum_{m'=m+1}^{M-1} \boldsymbol{a}_m^H \boldsymbol{\Xi}_m \boldsymbol{a}_{m'} b_{m'} + \sqrt{\tilde{\gamma}} \boldsymbol{a}_m^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_m \boldsymbol{w}. \tag{24}$$

Since v_m has unit variance from (21), ρ_m is regarded as the SINR for the LMMSE estimator $\hat{b}_m$. From (22), we obtain

$$I(b_m; \hat{b}_m | b_0, \ldots, b_{m-1}) = I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m). \tag{25}$$

C. Worse-Cast Additive Noise

Lemma 1: Consider the input covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$ given by (11), and fix SNR $\tilde{\gamma} > 0$ and load $\alpha > 0$. Under Assumptions 1 and 2, there exists some constant $A_\alpha > 0$ such that the multiuser efficiency $\rho_m/(\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}\tilde{\gamma})$ normalized by Δ_{t} is bounded from above by A_α for all $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}, \Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \in (0, 1/2]$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$, channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$, and all $m \in [0:M)$ in the large-system limit.

Proof: Since the maximum eigenvalue of (21) is bounded from above by 1, we have an upper bound on the SINR (23),

$$\frac{\rho_m}{\tilde{\gamma}} = \frac{\boldsymbol{a}_m^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_m \boldsymbol{a}_m}{\|\boldsymbol{a}_m\|^2} \|\boldsymbol{a}_m\|^2 < \left\| \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}} \boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{Q}_M^{1/2} \boldsymbol{e}_{M,m} \right\|^2, \tag{26}$$

where $\boldsymbol{e}_{M,m}$ is the mth column of $\boldsymbol{I}_M$. Repeating the same argument yields

$$\frac{\rho_m}{\tilde{\gamma}} < \sigma_{\max}^2 \left\| (2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{Q}_M^{1/2} \boldsymbol{e}_{M,m} \right\|^2, \tag{27}$$

where the maximum singular value $\sigma_{\max} > 0$ of the channel matrix $\min\{2L_{\mathrm{t}}, 2L_{\mathrm{r}}\}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}$ is uniformly bounded from Assumption 1.

Let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}$ denote the $M \times (2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1)$ matrix obtained by eliminating the columns $m \notin \mathcal{M}$ from $\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}$. From the definition (11) of $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$, we have

$$\frac{\rho_m}{\sigma_{\max}^2 \tilde{\gamma}} < \min\{1, \alpha^{-1}\} \lambda_{\max} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{e}_{M,m}\|^2, \tag{28}$$

where the maximum eigenvalue $\lambda_{\max} > 0$ of $2L_{\mathrm{t}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$ is uniformly bounded from Assumption 2. Since the mth column of $\boldsymbol{U}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}$ is equal to $\boldsymbol{s}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}(m/L_{\mathrm{t}})$ given by (3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}}_{L_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}^{\mathrm{H}} \boldsymbol{e}_{M,m}\|^2 &= \frac{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}}{L_{\mathrm{t}}} \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}} |e^{2\pi j m \Delta_{\mathrm{t}} m'/L_{\mathrm{t}}}|^2 \\ &= \left(2 + L_{\mathrm{t}}^{-1}\right) \Delta_{\mathrm{t}}. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Thus, Lemma 1 holds. ■

A further lower bound on (25) is derived by using the fact that Gaussian noise is the worst-case noise for the additive noise channel with QPSK in the low SINR regime [20][2].

$$I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m) \geq I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m^{\mathrm{G}}), \tag{30}$$

with $v_m^{\mathrm{G}} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$, uniformly for all $\Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \in (0, 1/2]$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$, and all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ in the dense limit $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \to 0$ after taking the large-system limit. Applying (19), (25), and (30) to (18) yields

$$\frac{1}{M} I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}) \geq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m^{\mathrm{G}}) \tag{31}$$

in the dense limit after taking the large-system limit.

D. Second-Order Optimality of QPSK

We use the second-order optimality of the QPSK symbol b_m to evaluate the mutual information $I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m^{\mathrm{G}})$. Let $b_m^{\mathrm{G}} \sim \mathcal{CN}(0,1)$ denote a CSCG data symbol with unit power. Since QPSK is second-order optimal for the AWGN channel [21], we have

$$\frac{|I(b_m; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m + v_m^{\mathrm{G}}) - I(b_m^{\mathrm{G}}; \sqrt{\rho_m} b_m^{\mathrm{G}} + v_m^{\mathrm{G}})|}{\rho_m^2} \to 0 \tag{32}$$

uniformly for all $\Delta_{\mathrm{r}} \in (0, 1/2]$, covariance matrices $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1} \in \mathfrak{S}_{2L_{\mathrm{t}}+1}$, and all channel instances $\mathcal{C} \in \mathfrak{C}$ in the dense limit $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \to 0$ after taking the large-system limit.

Applying (32) to (31), from Lemma 1 we find

$$\frac{1}{M} I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}) \geq \frac{1}{M} C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) + o(\Delta_{\mathrm{t}}^2), \tag{33}$$

in the dense limit $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \to 0$ after taking the large-system limit. In the derivation of (33), we have used the fact that the LMMSE-SIC for Gaussian signaling achieves the constrained capacity $C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})$ given by (8) [7]. Dividing both sides by Δ_{t}, we have

$$\frac{L_{\mathrm{t}}}{2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}} \frac{I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}) - C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}})}{L_{\mathrm{t}}} \geq 0 \tag{34}$$

in the dense limit $\Delta_{\mathrm{t}} \to 0$ after taking the large-system limit. Since the upper bound $C_{\mathrm{opt}}(\boldsymbol{Q}_M; \tilde{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}) - I(\boldsymbol{b}; \boldsymbol{y}) \geq 0$ is trivial, we arrive at Theorem 3.

V. Numerical Simulation

In numerical simulations, we use an independent P-path Rayleigh fading model to generate the channel matrix $\boldsymbol{G}_{\Delta_{\mathrm{t}},\Delta_{\mathrm{r}}}$ in the angular domain. In each discrete path, the attenuation is independently sampled from the CSCG distribution with variance $1/P$, while the departure and incident angles are independently sampled from the uniform distribution on $[0, 2\pi)$. The condition $P \geq 2\min\{L_{\mathrm{t}}, L_{\mathrm{r}}\}$ is necessary for achieving the maximum spatial degrees of freedom.

We focus on single-user MIMO downlink in which the transmitter has a larger antenna array than the receiver. For

[2] Although the real additive noise channel with binary phase-shift keying was considered in [20], a generalization to the QPSK case is straightforward.



Fig. 2. Ergodic achievable rate divided by $2\min\{L_{\rm t}, L_{\rm r}\}$ versus the normalized SNR $\tilde{\gamma}$ for $L_{\rm t} = 3$, $L_{\rm r} = 1$, $\Delta_{\rm r} = 0.5$, and $P = 4$.

simplicity, the receiver is assumed to use the critical antenna separation $\Delta_{\rm r} = 1/2$. Postulate that channel state information (CSI) is available at the receiver, while CSI is unknown to the transmitter. For the densely spaced case $\Delta_{\rm t} < 1/2$, we consider the diagonal matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_M = (2L_{\rm t} + 1)^{-1}{\rm diag}\{\mathbf{1}_{L_{\rm t}+1}, \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}_{L_{\rm t}}\}$ to generate the input covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{Q}_M$ given by (11), while $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{2L_{\rm t}} = (2L_{\rm t})^{-1}\boldsymbol{I}_{2L_{\rm t}}$ is used for the critically spaced case $\Delta_{\rm t} = 1/2$.

Figure 2 shows the ergodic achievable rates versus the normalized SNR $\tilde{\gamma} = \gamma/(4\Delta_{\rm t}\Delta_{\rm r})$, in which γ denotes the actual SNR. We find that the constrained capacity for the densely spaced case $\Delta_{\rm t} = 1/4$ is slightly smaller than that for the critically spaced case $\Delta_{\rm t} = 1/2$. 16 quadrature amplitude modulation (QAM) and QPSK get closer toward the corresponding constrained capacity, respectively, as the normalized SNR decreases. The latter observation is consistent with the second-order optimality of the modulation schemes for the MIMO channel in the low SNR regime [21].

Unfortunately, QPSK for the densely spaced case is slightly inferior to 16 QAM for the critically spaced case, while it is superior to QPSK for the critically spaced case in the high SNR regime. However, the gap between QPSK for the densely spaced case and 16 QAM would shrink if larger antenna arrays were used, since Theorems 1 and 2 imply that the gap in capacity tends to zero in the large-system limit. We conclude that using densely spaced transmit antennas is an alternative approach to increasing the achievable transmission rate, instead of using higher-order modulation.

Acknowledgment

The author was in part supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (A) (MEXT/JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 26709029), Japan, and by the Grant-in-Aid for Exploratory Research (JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 15K13987), Japan.

References

[1] A. S. Y. Poon, R. W. Brodersen, and D. N. C. Tse, "Degrees of freedom in multiple-antenna channels: A signal space approach," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 2, pp. 523–536, Feb. 2005.

[2] J. E. Mazo, "Faster-than-Nyquist signaling," *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 1451–1462, Oct. 1975.

[3] F. Rusek and J. B. Anderson, "Constrained capacities for faster-than-Nyquist signaling," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 764–775, Feb. 2009.

[4] Y. G. Yoo and J. H. Cho, "Asymptotic optimality of binary faster-than-Nyquist signaling," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 9, pp. 788–790, Sep. 2010.

[5] R. Janaswamy, "Effect of element mutual coupling on the capacity of fixed length linear arrays," *IEEE Antennas Wireless Propag. Lett.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 157–160, 2002.

[6] J. W. Wallace and M. A. Jensen, "Mutual coupling in MIMO wireless systems: A rigorous network theory analysis," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1317–1325, Jul. 2004.

[7] D. N. C. Tse and P. Viswanath, *Fundamentals of Wireless Communication*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

[8] A. S. Y. Poon, D. N. C. Tse, and R. W. Brodersen, "Impact of scattering on the capacity, diversity, and propagation range of multiple-antenna channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 1087–1100, Mar. 2006.

[9] D. N. C. Tse and S. V. Hanly, "Linear multiuser receivers: effective interference, effective bandwidth and user capacity," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 641–657, Mar. 1999.

[10] S. Verdú and S. Shamai (Shitz), "Spectral efficiency of CDMA with random spreading," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 622–640, Mar. 1999.

[11] A. M. Tulino, A. Lozano, and S. Verdú, "Impact of antenna correlation on the capacity of multiantenna channels," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 7, pp. 2491–2509, Jul. 2005.

[12] T. Tanaka, "A statistical-mechanics approach to large-system analysis of CDMA multiuser detectors," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 11, pp. 2888–2910, Nov. 2002.

[13] A. L. Moustakas, S. H. Simon, and A. M. Sengupta, "MIMO capacity through correlated channels in the presence of correlated interferers and noise: A (not so) large N analysis," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 49, no. 10, pp. 2545–2561, Oct. 2003.

[14] K. Takeda, S. Uda, and Y. Kabashima, "Analysis of CDMA systems that are characterized by eigenvalue spectrum," *Europhys. Lett.*, vol. 76, no. 6, pp. 1193–1199, 2006.

[15] C. K. Wen and K. K. Wong, "Asymptotic analysis of spatially correlated MIMO multiple-access channels with arbitrary signaling inputs for joint and separate decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 252–268, Jan. 2007.

[16] K. Takeuchi, T. Tanaka, and T. Yano, "Asymptotic analysis of general multiuser detectors in MIMO DS-CDMA channels," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 486–496, Apr. 2008.

[17] R. R. Müller, D. Guo, and A. L. Moustakas, "Vector precoding for wireless MIMO systems and its replica analysis," *IEEE J. Sel. Areas Commun.*, vol. 26, no. 3, pp. 530–540, Apr. 2008.

[18] M. A. Girnyk, M. Vehkaperä, and L. K. Rasmussen, "Large-system analysis of correlated MIMO multiple access channels with arbitrary signaling in the presence of interference," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 2060–2073, Apr. 2014.

[19] K. Takeuchi, "Asymptotic optimality of massive MIMO systems using densely spaced transmit antennas," submitted to *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 2016, [Online]. Available: http://arxiv.org/abs/1601.05638.

[20] C. R. Chan, "Worst interference for coherent binary channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 209–210, Mar. 1971.

[21] S. Verdú, "Spectral efficiency in the wideband regime," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 48, no. 6, pp. 1319–1343, Jun. 2002.